

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/082,616	Applicant(s) PERREAULT ET AL.	
	Examiner Dean O. Takaoka	Art Unit 2817	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Dean O. Takaoka.

(3) David J. Perrault.

(2) Paul D. Durkee.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 14 December 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-10, 14-33, 35-43, 45-61 and 67-78.

Identification of prior art discussed: Veisz et al, Hamill et al, Fuji et al, Waffenschmidt et al, Uchida et al, Nguyen, Smith et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The prior art of record versus the claims was discussed. The prior art showed a resonant condition "i.e. notch" causing cancellation of capacitance with respect to the resonant inductance where Applicant's invention did not cause a resonant condition thus not effecting the capacitance (or voltage) of the capacitor with respect to the applied inductance. The Examiner agreed the prior art showed a resonant condition and the claims would be allowable if further defined to distinguish over the prior art.